



Ad Hoc Work Group
PRINEVILLE RESERVOIR
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN/MASTER PLAN

Meeting No. 1 Summary

Meeting Date: April 19, 2001

I. MEETING ATTENDEES

AHWG Members:

- Diane Bohle, Chamber of Commerce*
- Bill Crawford, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD)*
- Brian Ferry, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW)*
- Boyd Goodpaster, South Shore Resident*
- Amy Green, Friends of Roberts Bay*
- Bert Hamm, North Shore Resident*
- Laura Hawes, Prineville Resort*
- Jim Hensley, Crook County Undersheriff*
- Ed Hodges, Oregon Hunters*
- Mike McCabe, Crook County Commissioner
- Brad Nye, Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs
- Larry Rasmussen, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- Wayne Shuyler, Oregon State Marine Board*
- Russell Rhoden, Ochoco Irrigators
- Dan Skillings, Central Oregon Bass Club*
- Tina Whitman, Crooked River Watershed Council*
- Ron Wortman, U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

Planning Team:

- Carolyn Burpee Stone, Reclamation, PN Regional Office, Regional RMP Coordinator*
- Vicki Kellerman, Reclamation, PN Regional Office, Team Leader
- Connie Wensman, Reclamation, Realty Specialist*
- Chuck Korson, Reclamation, Lower Columbia Area Office, Natural Resource Specialist*
- Kristen Stallman, OPRD*
- Kevin Butterbaugh, EDAW, Project Manager, Consultant Team*
- Jim Keany, EDAW, Terrestrial Ecologist, Consultant Team*
- Peter Carr, EDAW, Public Involvement, Consultant Team*
- John Petrovsky, John Petrovsky Associates, Public Involvement Specialist, Consultant Team*

** denotes attendance at first AHWG meeting*

II. INTRODUCTION/OVERVIEW OF AGENDA

This document is a summary of the first Ad Hoc Work Group (AHWG) Meeting for the Prineville Reservoir RMP/Master Plan, held April 19, 2001 in Prineville, OR at the Prineville Library. The meeting agenda is included in the AHWG binder. The purpose of this summary is to document the topics and issues discussed at the AHWG meeting.

Planning Team Introductions

John Petrovsky (JPA) began the meeting by briefly introducing each of the Planning Team members (listed above). The main participants on the Planning Team include Reclamation, OPRD, and consulting specialists providing assistance to Reclamation (EDAW and JPA).

The unique relationship between Reclamation and OPRD was discussed, noting that this is Reclamation's first RMP to be conducted in tandem with a state agency who is preparing a master plan. John also explained the role and use of the AHWG binders, which were distributed to all AHWG members. As we move through the two-year RMP/MP process and hold subsequent AHWG meetings, material will be distributed to the AHWG, and this material is best organized in the supplied binders.

AHWG Introductions

The members of the AHWG then introduced themselves, in seating order, and identified their affiliation. AHWG members in attendance are listed above. The intent of Reclamation and OPRD in forming the AHWG is to ensure participation by the wide range of stakeholders with an interest in Prineville Reservoir – agencies, local organizations, recreation users, residents, etc.

III. OVERVIEW OF THE PLANNING PROCESS

Goals/Vision

Carolyn Burpee Stone (Reclamation) and John introduced the Resource Management Plan (RMP) process, stating that the goal is to emphasize sustainable solutions for the future use and management of the reservoir and surrounding Reclamation lands. This RMP/MP is an update to the earlier 10-year RMP (completed in 1992). Unlike the 1992 RMP, this update will be combined with a Master Plan (MP) for Prineville State Park, with Reclamation and OPRD working together as partners. Using the 1992 RMP as a starting point, the Planning Team will take a fresh look at the key issues facing the community, extracting from the 1992 plan what is still relevant and revising as necessary.

The concurrent study regarding water allocation from Prineville Reservoir is not part of the RMP/MP process; water allocation is within Reclamation's jurisdiction but outside the RMP/MP process (and hence considered a sideboard issue). However, the RMP/MP will need to coordinate and incorporate issues related to water allocation. A similar situation exists with existing and future County Road plans – these are outside Reclamation's jurisdiction, but the RMP/MP will need to respond to significant situations. In accomplishing this, Reclamation will need to coordinate with the counties and other agencies, and clarify specific responsibilities.

Carolyn stressed that one of the main goals of the process is to produce a plan that is implementable and realistic; this will require that participants in the process be honest and up-front when identifying issues. For example, that's why the Crook County Sheriff's office is represented on the AHWG; they are responsible for enforcing the law locally and will be able to offer valuable input on what works on the ground, and what does not, based on real experience.

The Planning Team explained that the primary product of this two-year process will be the RMP/MP. In addition, the Planning Team will also prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) document, developed under federal regulations of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The RMP and EA will be prepared in concert, with the intent of the RMP/MP to be self mitigating – that is, it will be designed to benefit the environment and not create adverse effects. To facilitate this process, the larger Planning Team is composed of a team of technical experts that can address resource-specific issues such as soils, water quality, terrestrial biology, wetlands, etc. Their expertise will feed into RMP/MP development.

Study Area Boundary and Key Players

The Planning Team prepared large geographic information system (GIS) maps of the study area, posting these on the walls of the meeting room; the boundary of the study area was pointed out, and AHWG members were invited to later look over the various maps for clarification and context. Additional smaller maps were also passed out for inclusion in the binders and for future reference.

Land management responsibilities in the study area include Reclamation, OPRD (who manages all the recreation areas in the study area boundary), and ODFW (who manages the State Wildlife Area). The map also shows the Prineville Resort lands and an area of private lands (Bottero Park) within the study area.

It was clarified that Reclamation only has authority on Reclamation lands in the study area; however, in developing the updated RMP/MP, the Planning Team will also examine adjacent activities (those that occur outside the study area boundaries) and work with the other managing entities.

Overview of Tribal/Public Involvement Program

A recurring theme in the first meeting was that the AHWG plays a crucial role in the RMP/MP development; as members of the AHWG are intended to represent various constituencies, the Group is one of the primary components of a larger Public Involvement Program. Carolyn noted that active participation and dialog amongst the AHWG will be instrumental in developing an implementable plan. Other elements of the public involvement program include public meetings, Newsbriefs, a frequently updated and informative /interactive Internet website, and public comment on the Environmental Assessment.

John stressed that stakeholder input, from the diverse user group of the reservoir, is instrumental in plan development; this is one of the main reasons that the process takes two years, as it takes time to work deliberately with the public and other agencies to develop a realistic and meaningful plan.

John also referred to a handout listing the various components of the Public Involvement Program, included in the binders.

RMP/MP Process and Schedule

Kevin Butterbaugh (EDAW) presented an overview of the main tasks associated with preparing the RMP/MP, as well as the anticipated schedule for accomplishing these tasks. He noted that the Work Plan Schedule (a large graphic prepared for the meeting identifying the study tasks and their anticipated start and completion dates) might seem overly complex and foreign, but that the AHWG would become familiar with the various concepts and components over time. The Work Plan was included as a handout in the binders.

Kevin identified the three main task groups, as shown on the Work Plan: (1) public involvement program, (2) RMP/MP, and (3) EA. Coordination among these three task groups is essential, as they work together and are interrelated. The various AHWG meetings and public meetings will be scheduled to coincide with RMP/MP milestones, such as development of draft alternatives. At the start of this planning process, we'll

be working first to develop an initial list of identified key issues; concurrently, Planning Team members will be conducting a current resource inventory to update the conditions as described in the 1992 RMP. The next step will be to conduct an opportunities/constraints analysis, which will be followed by developing the Problem Statement (which is a report back on each and every issue, what has or hasn't been done to address these issues, and if and how the issue will be handled in the RMP/MP). Kevin noted that there are issues outside of Reclamation's jurisdiction or outside the RMP/MP process, referred to as sideboards (e.g., the water allocation study). The RMP/MP might identify such sideboards but will not include actions to specifically address them. The next step in the process is to develop goals and objectives (a process which will include extensive AHWG input), followed by crafting alternatives (in compliance with NEPA). After these steps, the Planning Team can begin preparing the Draft RMP/MP. Kevin pointed out this stage of the process on the Work Plan, noting its overlap with other key tasks. Then we'll work on an impact analysis (i.e., EA), paying particular attention to actions that would be self mitigating – the EA is a planning vehicle to steer us away from problems in the future by identifying potential adverse impacts, and designing the RMP/MP actions to avoid such impacts. At this point in the process, the Planning Team prepares the Draft EA, while RMP/MP preparation goes on hold.

Kevin noted that the public involvement efforts feed into the development of the RMP/MP and EA. In addition, the built-in overlap ensures integration of the various components.

The Ad Hoc Work Group -- Role and Process

John led a discussion on how and why the AHWG is being developed. He stressed that the primary goal of the AHWG's makeup is to ensure representation of the various stakeholders at the reservoir. Diverse interests ensure a balanced viewpoint and perspective on many of the potentially contentious issues that might arise. Our intent is to work with a group of about 20 people (at maximum), so there is still room for a few more people if we identify needs or missing representation at this stage. He invited AHWG members present to share any ideas or preferences they have for additional representation.

John introduced the idea of advised consent (rather than consensus) as a goal of the process; to reiterate, the AHWG will be instrumental in development of the plan, and we hope that you'll be comfortable helping to present the Final RMP/MP at the end of the process. The AHWG will walk every step of the process with the Planning Team.

He noted, however, that the AHWG is not a formal advisory group, and that final decision-making will be made by the lead agencies (i.e., Reclamation and OPRD). Carolyn added that the AHWG and other local input is exactly what makes these plans successful and enables these plans to work.

Because of the long timeframe for plan development, John emphasized that commitment to AHWG membership is very important. If members can't commit to making at least 5 of the 7 scheduled meetings, and carving out time to look over drafted materials, he recommended suggesting an alternative member be found. He noted that the process is complex and will require some learning, and that we can't spend additional time constantly bringing new members up to speed. He encouraged AHWG members to review the schedule and ensure their availability. Carolyn added that if you can't make a particular meeting, it is appropriate to find someone to fill in for you to take notes. In addition, the AHWG meetings are officially open to the public, but it is only appropriate for designated AHWG members to actively participate. A short period of time is allocated at the end of every meeting to take any comments from the public at large. There are also scheduled public meetings and workshops throughout the process that are appropriate forums for general public participation and comment.

John also stressed that AHWG members are there essentially to represent their identified constituencies, and that their names would therefore be made public (e.g., on the website, published in Newsbriefs). The

members therefore have a responsibility to report back to their constituencies as needed, as well as voice their identified concerns.

To prepare for the various AHWG meetings, the Planning Team will generally distribute materials to look over about one week prior to the meetings. Please come to the meetings familiar with the materials and ready for a discussion. While at the meetings, we'll strive to provide an environment of mutual respect. There are no stupid ideas or questions, and we're all here to listen and balance the various perspectives.

In terms of housekeeping, the Thursday night timeslot was discussed, and it was agreed that we should keep the meeting for Thursday nights, but start at 6 p.m. rather than 6:30. The next meeting was then scheduled for June 14. A brief discussion followed regarding the special nature of that meeting, as it is scheduled to also include a study area tour. Details were postponed for later discussion.

IV. FINDINGS OF ISSUE/OPPORTUNITY IDENTIFICATION & AHWG OBSERVATIONS

Reclamation Mission and Guiding Laws and Policies

Carolyn led a discussion on Authorization and Compliance issues, for which she prepared a handout summarizing the main federal considerations. (See the handout for more detailed information on these issues, which are summarized here.) Prineville Reservoir is part of the larger Crooked River Project, authorized by Congress in 1956 to provide flood control, minimum basic health and safety facilities, minimum streamflows for fish and wildlife enhancement, and irrigation water, amended in both 1959 and 1964. Reclamation also has the authority to develop RMPs for its projects (under the Recreation Management Act of 1992). Reclamation does not have overarching authority regarding all implementation actions and therefore each action proposed is evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Carolyn also introduced/explained the role of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act and Title 28, authorizing recreation facility development and partnerships with non-federal partnerships. This allows for federal/non-federal cost sharing as well (50/50 for recreation, 75/25 for fish and wildlife). Reclamation is required to comply with other legislation in managing its lands and facilities, including the Endangered Species Act (ESA), Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, National Historic Preservation Act, and other federal laws and policies.

At Prineville Reservoir, Reclamation has several existing management agreements, such as the concessions contract with Prineville Resort, a license agreement with ODFW for the administration of fish and wildlife resources within the State Wildlife Area, and a lease agreement with OPRD for managing all recreation facilities on Reclamation lands.

Kristen Stallman then gave a brief perspective on the role of the State Park Master Plan, indicating that OPRD prepares such plans to protect natural resources while providing recreation opportunities. These plans help the agency with funding, priorities, management issues, etc. A Park Master Plan presents the big picture and is required by State law.

AHWG members raised a couple of questions at this stage. Boyd Goodpaster asked if there is an existing State Park Master Plan for Prineville; Kristen replied that there is not, and that the agency has been relying on the 1992 RMP to serve this interim role. Boyd also asked where the funding source came from to develop such Master Plans, and Kristen noted that it's a grant project, partially funded by Reclamation. Chuck Korson added that the State MP will focus on recreation, such as opportunities for facility development.

Laura Hawes asked if Jasper Knolls falls outside of the boundary. The answer is yes, Jasper Knolls is

officially outside the study area. This led to a discussion of whether it would be appropriate to include a representative of this area on the AHWG as they are directly adjacent and will have some concerns. Boyd suggested that Bert Hamm represent the Jasper Knolls constituency; Bert mentioned that he hadn't heard from them specifically about the RMP/MP, but he has represented their interests on previous issues, such as fire protection. Bert agreed to contact the Jasper Knolls group and see if it would be appropriate for him to represent their concerns.

Summary of Issues and Opportunities

Although this is the first AHWG meeting, public involvement efforts have already begun, with data collected on issues the public believes to be important. The first Newsbrief was mailed in February 2001, and one set of two public meetings/workshops were conducted to initiate public involvement (one in Prineville, one in Portland). Based on input received from these forums, the Planning Team conducted a preliminary informal data analysis of input received to date, specifically on important issues. This analysis was summarized in two spreadsheets, which were distributed to the AHWG. John noted that these results are by no means a scientific survey, but they do provide a preliminary indication of the potential hot buttons the RMP/MP will need to address.

As shown on the spreadsheets, the two overwhelmingly identified issues of concern include: (1) protection of natural resources/environmental issues, and (2) law enforcement/public safety. Other commonly identified issues of concern include water quality, access roads, and use levels at Roberts Bay. In general, the feedback received indicates that there are growing conflicts between available resources and the number of recreation users.

V. AHWG Observations

Starting with the issues identified and described above, the remainder of this first AHWG meeting was primarily devoted to observations of the individual AHWG members, as summarized below.

Wayne Shuyler, Oregon State Marine Board: Our real concern/focus is on the water surface and access to the lake for boating. Five of my main points are summarized below.

- There's a facilities grant program and the Marine Board has funded six grants up to \$200,000 for Prineville; there is also a 6-year boating facilities plan for the state. The Planning Team should look at the state plan and see if it's relevant for Prineville.
- The Board has a clean vessel plan (e.g., vessel waste disposal plan), with a list of potential projects to fund (e.g., floating restroom).
- Every 3 years, the Board does a user survey (registered boat owners) – the 1996 and 1999 reports are current. The next survey will cover 10/00 through 10/02, with the survey hitting the streets shortly thereafter. Results will be around late spring/early summer next year.
- The Board contracts for law enforcement with state police and county sheriff offices (including Crook County) for boat patrols. We've compiled lots of data on patrol hours, citations, warnings, contracts, funding.
- Regulatory jurisdiction. For example, at Prineville the upper end of the reservoir has a posted speed limit of 10 mph, and there's a no wake zone all the way around the shoreline. Statewide rules apply and cover reckless operation, rules of the road, and personal watercraft (PWC) restrictions. There's a proposal to have a slow/no wake zone in Roberts Bay. The usual process could be followed to accomplish this, or it could be referred to the RMP. Wayne noted that he can't tie the Board's hands with RMP/MP recommendations, but it is certainly appropriate to talk about these issues here. The Board will hold its own public hearing regardless of this the RMP/MP decision, but we can time it to dovetail with this process.

Brian Ferry, ODFW: We're a partner with Reclamation; I've been here for many years (since 1975), so I have background on many important issues, including:

- Big game wintering range – This is an important area for big game, especially deer; elk are also increasingly using the area; we should be thinking about seasonal use restrictions.
- Waterfowl nesting/brooding – This occurs primarily in the reservoir's upper end due to the aquatic habitat and shallow waters.
- Birds of prey – There is one identified bald eagle nest, as well as several golden eagle nests in the area (although not on Reclamation lands).
- Human disturbance – Most of these natural resources don't do well with human disturbance.
- Fisheries issues – Warm water fishery and trout fishery are particularly important.
- Noxious weeds – This is increasingly an important issue.
- Overuse by people (all types) – ORVs are part of the problem, but lower impact "loved to death" activities occur – hiking, camping, mountain biking, etc.
- Balancing resources (use vs. habitat protection)
- Access through public lands to private – There are numerous private parcels surrounding the reservoir, and there are increasing requests for private access/easements. There is a mentality of a big playground around these parcels, and access is demanded.
- Coordination – My final concern is to improve coordination among the agencies/players.

Bert Hamm, North Shore Resident: Bert noted that the top 8 or 9 issues as listed on the analysis matrix are of concern to him. In particular, he identified:

- Water levels.
- Recreation.
- Use Levels - The place is so popular that the use levels are problematic, especially at Roberts Bay – "it's a zoo."

Diane Bohle, Prineville Chamber of Commerce: We're interested primarily in tourism, but use levels need to balance with the natural environment. I've got concerns about adequate sanitation – where do people dump RV waste? Is there an emergency services plan in place? Rock hounders are rampant in the area – is that a compatible use? I'm here to listen and learn, and I'm relatively new. Recreation uses are key, especially fishing and hunting. Do they sell water out of the reservoir? (the Planning Team noted here that the separate water reallocation study was the appropriate forum to address this issue). Other uses are also desirable and can be less intrusive, such as bird watching. In summary:

- Tourism
- Sanitation
- Rock hounding
- Emergency Services Plan
- Recreation Uses

Laura Hawes, Prineville Resort: My family has managed the Resort, as partners with Reclamation, since 1992. We're looking forward to the two-way dialog that will be established by this process, as well as insight into our future; every issue, action affects what's going on at the Resort. We reside here all year round, so we see the full range of use levels (that is, seasonal patterns). It's wonderful to see the full range of life (including birds, eagles, and deer). We also see what the public can do over time. There is currently no education in terms of camping and related impacts. It's a free for all out there during the prime recreation season. We deal with boat rentals, campground issues, environmental issues. In summary:

- Future of the resort
- Use levels – overuse and impacts
- Wildlife and natural resources
- Public education
- Coordination with Reclamation/OPRD

Amy Green, Friends of Roberts Bay: I'm in the minority in this AHWG. Our primary concern is to keep access to unimproved campgrounds in the Roberts Bay area. It's one of the last places in Oregon that you can go and camp next to a lake. The situation has improved since they put in garbage collection and toilets. Unfortunately, there are a few bad people that can ruin it for everyone else. Many of the camping spots have been closed (e.g., the Island). It's crowded, but it's always been crowded – and now it's concentrated due to restrictions elsewhere. It seems like the cattle grazing that occurs there would have significant impacts, comparable to the campers. In summary:

- Access to primitive campsites, especially at Roberts Bay

Jim Hensley, Crook County Undersheriff: I've been here for 20 years, so I've seen it all. It's so much better nowadays than in the past. Public safety is the number one concern, and our response time to incidents is crucial. The marine patrol is a key element of our effectiveness, and coordination with the Marine Board has been important. Roberts Bay use is a public safety issue (e.g., the no wake zone that's proposed) – there are numerous activities (tubing, swimming, and boating) that occur there simultaneously. Most people are responsible, but there's a few bad folks that cause problems. For example, we've had fire arm assaults. Another concern is access and response time, which on land can be up to 1.5 hours. Enforcing ORV use is also an issue. Some of the trails up there look like roads because of use; if it looks like a road, people will use it. We need to clearly define routes in the upper reservoir area. Another area of concern is the Powder House Cove area, especially now that access road is paved. People launch boats there off the gravel, there's no parking to speak of, and use is increasing. To reiterate – our primary concerns are public safety and access time. In summary:

- Public safety
- Use of Roberts Bay
- Response time, access
- Enforcing ORV use
- Use of Powder House Cove area

Boyd Goodpaster, South Shore Resident: My family has been coming here since the early 1960s, and we bought property on the south shore in 1971. Things are much better now. The south side used to be unpatrolled and there was an anything goes attitude. Things are much better now, with the sheriff's presence as well as the addition of toilets/garbage collection. I'm concerned about the restricted access areas. Now that north shore areas are closed, those people come to Roberts Bay – use is concentrated, funneled to the south side. Couple that with increasing use and population and we've got some overuse issues to deal with. Therefore, examining law enforcement is important, as is access (e.g., the terrible road up by the Cattle Guard/Rose property area). There's also a boat ramp issue, with only one ramp in the area. We need another ramp on the south side (I have some specific ideas on where it could go). Every issue identified on the larger matrix is important. In summary:

- Restricted access
- Access roads
- Roberts Bay use
- Boat ramp on the south side

Dan Skillings, Central Oregon Bass Club: This is all new to me; I'll report back next time after talking to my constituency.

Ed Hodges, Oregon Hunters Association: Brian (ODFW) addressed all the important issues; our main concerns are wildlife habitat and big game use.

Tina Whitman, Crooked River Watershed Council: Tina noted that she needs to evaluate her participation on the AHWG. Her group's interests are primarily scientific and natural resource based, and focus especially on flow releases and downstream impacts; the RMP/MP might not be the appropriate forum for their participation. Key issues of concern include:

- Streamflow and downstream impacts are essential, including the impacts on water quality, fish, and the wild and scenic river section. (Not within the scope of the RMP/MP)
- Natural flow regime to maintain riparian zone. (Not within the scope of the RMP/MP)
- If anadromous fish reintroduction at Pelton Round Butte occurs, fish passage will become an issue at Prineville. (Not within the scope of the RMP/MP)
- Noxious weeds – Traditional land management activities adjacent to the reservoir (e.g., juniper control) and how would land management agencies work to deal with public perceptions of this practice.
- Water quality.
- Education – How to engage new land owners and absentee land owners.
- Protecting riparian areas, especially near roads, bridges, campgrounds.

Bill Crawford, OPRD: Our main concerns have been identified. We are recreation providers, as well as resource protectors. In short, our key concerns include:

- Public safety/public health - We have to determine how to meet current demands and deal with increasing future use; densities are an intense concern – what about the next 10 years if central Oregon continues this growth?
- Education/enforcement – We need to change the culture, change the perception of the proper use of public lands in Oregon. Those days of the past are gone.

John concluded this discussion by noting this is an excellent start to issue identification. To effectively deal with such issues in depth, we'll break out into three or so subgroups at future meetings to get into them in detail. These will all feed directly into the planning process and the Problem Statement.

VI. Resource Inventory Overview (Planning Team Summary)

Kevin introduced this portion of the meeting, stating that the Planning Team has already started conducting the resource inventory, facilitated by the existing 1992 RMP as well as existing OPRD data. Tonight, the Planning Team members present will share a brief overview of what we've collected so far. John noted that in the future, the Planning Team will be providing the AHWG a succinct analysis of resource data, not just a huge data dump to wade through.

Natural Resources (presented by Jim Keany, EDAW). We'll be covering a full range of biological and physical sciences/resources. The baseline information will be used in preparing both the EA and RMP/MP. Our main question is "What's out there?" We need this information to make logical decisions on such issues as campground development. We'll also be looking at what the problems are and how to solve them. The 1992 RMP has some solid data; some need to be updated, but it's a great start. There's a very good

soils survey, and there's an Oregon State University Watershed Analysis study for the entire drainage addressing disturbance regime. The BLM did some related work on ORV use. All of these will feed into erosion estimates and planning. OPRD and its consultants have an excellent resource inventory, aerial photos, vegetation cover map, and GIS, all of which provide great flexibility showing sensitive habitats (riparian zones, wetlands, rare plant communities). We're filling in this macro scale data with more detailed, site-specific information such as migratory routes of big game, wildlife trends, and sensitive wildlife species. We'll be drawing information from multiple sources. We also need information from local users to supplement this data set, as the local users know what's on the ground and can identify trends.

Cultural Resources (presented by Carolyn). We'll be looking at cultural resources which include archaeological, historical and cultural properties, Indian Trust Assets, and Indian sacred sites. As a federal agency, we have a responsibility to protect these resources. There's a Class I Archaeological Survey (conducted at a macro scale) for the whole study area, and we're in the process of completing some Class III surveys that involve on-the-ground site testing; some work is being completed this spring, examining potential sites in recreation expansion areas. We've been coordinating and will continue to coordinate with the Warm Springs Tribes on these efforts.

Public Use (presented by Kevin). We'll be looking at existing land use and management (including such issues as ownership, history, relationships), access and transportation (the road system and its condition, traffic volumes), socioeconomics, public services and utilities (fire, EMS, law enforcement, wastewater, solid waste, communications). And, obviously, we're addressing recreation. So far, we've examined the 1992 RMP and looked at changes to date. We're about 70 percent complete w/ these various resource inventories.

VII. CLOSING

In closing, John reiterated that there are some missing AHWG membership holes to consider and potentially fill. Chuck suggested that Deschutes County might be interested in participating. These contacts will be pursued by the Planning Team prior to the next meeting.

Next meeting - June 14, scheduled as an all day field trip and meeting.